REMARKS

Independent claim 28 recites, inter alia, that each compacting face includes a re-entrant portion extending from a respective salient point in the direction of rolling, which re-entrant portion defines a tangent lying outside of an imaginary straight line extending from such salient point to the next salient point in the direction of rolling (see the re-entrant portion indicated by newly added numeral 16a in Fig. 2).

That feature is absent from Cook et al. which provides a re-entrant formation 18 or 86 in the form of a recess, wherein a tangent to the re-entrant portion does not lie outside of an imaginary line extending between successive salient points. Such tangent is shown at T in the attached marked-up copy of Cook et al.

It is the presence of a re-entrant portion in the form of a recess in Cook et al. which creates a major difference between the presently claimed invention and the roller of Cook et al. That is, the presence of the re-entrant recess results in the roller falling forwardly and downwardly from each salient point and applying an intense impact against the ground. In contrast, the presently claimed invention exerts no such intense impacts against the ground, but instead performs a continuous kneading action.

Note also that in the invention defined by claim 28, the re-entrant portion is defined by a portion of the compacting face, whereas, as stated at column 3, lines 23-24 of Cook et al., the re-entrant formation is "followed in turn by a compacting face", i.e., the re-entrant formation is not formed by a portion of a compacting face.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 28 and dependent claims 29-36 distinguish patentably over Cook et al.

As regards independent claim 37, that claim recites that each compacting face is symmetrical about an imaginary radial line extending through the compacting face at a location midway between the salient points lying on opposite sides of that compacting face. As is evident from the accompanying marked-up copy of Fig. 2

of Cook et al., the compacting face is not symmetrical about such a radial line. That is, the compacting face portions A and B located on opposite sides of such a radial line are of markedly different configurations, i.e., the claimed symmetry does not exist. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 37 distinguishes patentably over Cook et al.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P

By: _____
Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: September 15, 2003